

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/078,033	JANIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew O Savage	1723	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Matthew O Savage.

(3) _____.

 (2) Mr. Thomas J. Menard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 February 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1, 19

Prior art documents discussed:

None
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to change "said" to --the-- on line 6 of claim 1 since the phrase "said connected upper and lower shell portions" did not have exact antecedent basis. Agreed to change "durom eter" which was a typographical error to --durometer-- on line 2 of claim 19. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details..